

Remarks

This is in response to the final Office Action mailed on November 16, 2004. Claims 7-10, 22-25, and 35-37 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 is amended to incorporate subject matter from claims 7-10. Claim 16 is amended to incorporate subject matter from claims 22-25. Claim 31 is amended to incorporate subject matter from claims 35-37. Claims 1, 11-16, 26-31, and 38-42 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Applicants preliminarily want to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended by the Examiner to Applicants' representative, Robert A. Kalinsky, during the telephonic interview of January 26, 2005. During the interview, a proposal to amend claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claims 7-10 was discussed, along with Bauer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,870,759. No agreement regarding the allowability of the claims was reached.

Claims 1-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bauer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,870,759. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded.

Preliminarily, it is respectfully noted that claims 2-6, 17-21, and 32-34 were canceled in the Amendment filed on August 25, 2004. In addition, claims 7-10, 22-25, and 35-37 are canceled herein. Removal of these canceled claims from the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

As noted in the previous Amendment, it is respectfully suggested that Bauer does not disclose or suggest initializing a first row pointer of a dataset with data from a database requested by the client computing system in response to the request by the client computing system, sending the initialized dataset to the client computing system, placing changes to the data by the client computing system in a second row pointer of the dataset, receiving the dataset with the changes, and comparing the first and second row pointers, as recited by claim 1.

Further, claim 1 recites declaring a state of the data in response to comparing the first and second row pointers, including:

- if the first row pointer is null, declaring the data to be new data in response to detecting the first row pointer to be null;
- if the second row pointer is null, declaring the data to be deleted data in response to detecting the second row pointer to be null;

- if the first and second row pointers are equal, declaring the data to be original data in response to detecting the first and second row pointer to be equal; and
- if the first and second row pointers are not equal, declaring the data to be updated data in response to detecting the first and second row pointers to not be equal.

The rejection identifies column 10, line 60 through column 11, line 11 of Bauer as disclosing the above-noted limitations of claim 1 (previously recited in canceled claims 7-10). This characterization of Bauer is respectfully traversed.

Bauer discloses at column 10, line 38 through column 11, line 11, a method for performing a conflict check between data sent by client node 20x and data on server node 10. The data sent by client node 20x is compared to the data on server node 10 to determine if a conflict has occurred. A conflict "occurs on a row when one or more data fields (columns) of the row change on both the client node 20x and the server node 10." Bauer, col. 10, ll. 42-44. A conflict can be resolved automatically in favor of either the client or server, or can be resolved manually. Bauer, col. 11, ll. 6-11.

Bauer fails to disclose or suggest declaring a state of data in response to comparing the first and second row pointers of a dataset to declare the data to be new data, deleted data, original data, and updated data. Specifically, Bauer does not disclose or suggest: if the first row pointer is null, declaring the data to be new data in response to detecting the first row pointer to be null; if the second row pointer is null, declaring the data to be deleted data in response to detecting the second row pointer to be null; if the first and second row pointers are equal, declaring the data to be original data in response to detecting the first and second row pointer to be equal; and if the first and second row pointers are not equal, declaring the data to be updated data in response to detecting the first and second row pointers to not be equal, as recited by claim 1.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, as well as claims 11-15 that depend therefrom, are respectfully requested for at least these reasons.

Claims 16 and 31, although not identical in scope to claim 1, include limitations similar to those noted above with respect to claim 1. Claims 16 and 31, as well as claims 26-30 and 38-42 that depend respectively therefrom, should therefore be allowable for at least similar reasons to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The remarks set forth above provide certain arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claims. There may be other reasons that the pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited references, and the right to raise any such other reasons or arguments in the future is expressly reserved.

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: Feb. 11, 2005

Robert A. Kalinsky
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471
RAK